



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,688	04/15/2005	Christian Beck	123477	1834
25944	7590	06/08/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3723		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,688	BECK, CHRISTIAN	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Maurina Rachuba	3723		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. *MAR*
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 8-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date / | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Applicant's amendment has overcome the objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Applicant's amendment has overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 8-11 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 5-146558. Please refer to figure 1 and the attached English language translation. '558 discloses scissors having two halves, each half including a blade, shank and ring and articulately coupled by means of a lock and including hard metal edges on the blades, the edges formed as massive elements extending over the entire thickness of the blades on mutually facing faces of the blades. It is noted that claim 8 contains a "product-by-process" limitation: "which are formed by welding application of a hard metal and a subsequent grinding step". MPEP 2113 states in part: "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the

Art Unit: 3723

prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Here, the resulting product appears to be the same as that disclosed by JP '558, that of a scissor blade with hard metal edges on the blades, the edges formed as massive elements extending over the entire thickness of the blades on mutually facing faces of the blades. If applicant argues that the steps of welding and grinding form a different product, he must provide evidence of such difference.

5. Claim 12 is finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 5-146558. '558 discloses that the hard metal is a cobalt alloy, but not the particular alloy claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the scissors' edge of any desired hard metal alloy, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Here, applicant has not specifically pointed out the criticality of using the claimed alloy, but has disclosed it as an example of the various alloys that may be used.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-7 are allowed.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record does not disclose or fairly teach a method of making a cutting edge, including pre-shaping the blade by a predetermined degree of curvature in the direction facing away from the blade, the pre-shaping substantially neutralized by

the heat of the welding process to bring the blade back into a final shape. The closest art, to JP 5-146558, does not disclose such shaping.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 26 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that '588 does not disclose the use of "massive" elements over the entire thickness of the blades, that the thin surface layer of '588 is incapable of repeated resharpening, and therefore applicant's claimed product is different than that taught by '588. The examiner disagrees. It is noted that applicant has disclosed the use of massive elements, but does not disclose a specific meaning for the term. "Massive" is a relative term, without specific definition, it can be interpreted to mean almost any mass relative to a substrate. The examiner considers that the material applied to the edges of '588 to be massive. Applicant's argument that the scissors of '588 are incapable of repeated sharpening is moot, applicant has not claimed any structure that would allow such resharpening. Applicant's argument that '588 does not recognize any objective benefit related to that among which the subject matter of the pending claims are directed is not correct, '588 clearly teaches that the blade disclosed is light, strong, and maintains sharpness. The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurina Rachuba whose telephone number is 571 272 4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272 4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. Rachuba/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3723